

1 Macdonald, the idea here is to overrule the Alsop Case.
2 The Alsop Case was based primarily on the language in
3 Section 43 of the present declaration of rights. The
4 Court of Appeals said, I have the language here somewhere--
5 Mr. Lewis is looking for it. ~~He may not be able to find~~
6 ~~it.~~

7 But in essence, what the Court of Appeals said
8 in its Alsop case was that it could not pass upon or
9 inquire into the efficacy of the regulations which had
10 been promulgated by the State Department of Assessments
11 and Taxation, because Article 43 mandated that if property
12 was devoted to farm or agricultural use and it was so
13 used, that was the end of the matter, no matter whether the
14 fellow who owned it was an investor, speculator, or
15 true farmer.

16 The question was the use vel non, ~~that~~ that was the
17 end of it. Our language seeks to change this by saying
18 that there shall be a classification for farm use but that
19 classification shall be defined by law. And this envisages
20 the General Assembly passing a definitional law which
21 will either itself define what a farm is or is not or